

University of Cambridge
Open Access Project Board

Minutes – 24 January 2013

Meeting held at 12.45-13.45 on Thursday 24 January 2013
in the Pro-Vice-Chancellors' Meeting Room, The Old Schools

Present:

Professor Lynn Gladden, Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Research (Chair)
Professor Steve Young, Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Planning and Resources
Professor Martin Daunton, Head of the School of the Humanities and Social Sciences
Professor Howard Chase, Head of the School of Technology
Mrs Anne Jarvis, University Librarian
Mrs Peta Stevens, Head of the University Research Office
Professor Andy Parker, Deputy Head of the Cavendish Laboratory
Mr John Norman, Director of Technology, University Library
Dr Gill Rands, Research Strategy Office (Secretary)

Apologies:

Professor Paul Luzio, Deputy Head of the School of Clinical Medicine

Declaration of Interest:

Professor Parker declared an interest as a Director of an (inactive) company involved in text/data mining.

1. Terms of Reference – Paper OAPB-1

1.1 The Chairman welcomed the members to the Board's first meeting and emphasized the importance of setting the appropriate framework for the project, recognising that there could be no 'one size fits all' solution.

1.2 The terms of reference for the Project Board were approved as:

- To ensure the University is ready to comply with the new RCUK terms on Open Access to research publications that will take effect from 1 April 2013.
- To make effective use of the time-limited BIS/RCUK allocation in support of the transition to Open Access.

In addressing these terms of reference, the Project Board will:

- Ensure a suitable policy framework is in place and remains relevant as circumstances develop.
- Consider sustainable and equitable mechanisms to handle the annual block grants for Gold access charges.
- Consider the roadmap for Open Access to research data in relation to publication Open Access.
- Approve monitoring and reporting mechanisms to meet University and funders' requirements.

1.3 It was agreed that development of the institutional repository (DSpace) was implicitly included in the scope of the project as a mechanism to achieve the above aims.

2. Open Access Policy Framework and Policy Questions – Paper OAPB-2

Policy framework

2.1 The aim in defining a policy framework was to establish a small number of simple and memorable guiding principles that described the University position on Open Access.

2.2 The proposed policy framework was approved with minor amendments and the addition of point (ii), as follows:

- i. The University of Cambridge is committed to disseminating its research and scholarship as widely as possible. In keeping with that commitment, it supports the principle that 'the results of research that have been publicly funded should be freely accessible in the public domain' and therefore it supports its staff in making their research available through Open Access (OA).
- ii. The University affirms that academics should not be deterred from publishing in the journal of their choice.
- iii. The University recommends Green OA (self-archiving) as the most cost-effective, sustainable way to achieve greater public access to research outputs and supports Green OA through the development of its institutional repository, or through subject based repositories and other open websites.
- iv. The University will support Gold OA, whereby the author is usually required to pay an Article Processing Charge to publish in an OA journal, only where funding is made available for this purpose by the research funder.
- v. The University supports the use of the widest form of licensing so that the article may be read and re-used. CC-BY is currently required by the published RCUK policy; this allows articles to be read and re-used for both non-commercial and commercial purposes.
- vi. Funder mandates are evolving and this framework may need regular review.

2.3 In relation to (v), it was noted that copyright was an important aspect of scholarly publishing that was not well understood by academics. Currently, the default contract typically transferred copyright to the publisher. It was agreed that it was desirable to develop an improved understanding of IPR positions for both individual academics and the University in the context of Open Access.

2.4 The majority of journals allowed some form of Green open access with an embargo period. The self-archiving rules for individual journals could be checked easily via the SHERPA-ROMEO database of publisher copyright policies: <http://www.sherpa.ac.uk/romeo/>.

2.5 Points to be followed up by project team (**Action: John Norman**):

- As part of the project communication process, academics should be encouraged to consider their options in relation to copyright when signing publishing contracts.
- Legal advice on the copyright liability should be sought.

Policy issues

2.6 It was agreed that the urgent policy issues highlighted in paper OAPB-2 should be dealt with as follows:

- Options and proposals in relation to arrangements for allocating money from the RCUK block grant (OAPB-2 paragraphs 4 and 7) should be investigated by the project team and brought to the Project Board for decision. **Action: John Norman.** The key issues were how the funds should be allocated across Faculties and Departments, and what might be the most effective partition of roles between central administration and devolved academic decision-making. The project team was gathering data to underpin these judgements.
- The questions around provision of additional University funds for Gold open access charges (OAPB-2 paragraph 5) would be held in abeyance, in light of the agreed policy framework and the anticipated evolution of the RCUK position. Use of the term 'full economic costs' in this context should be avoided.
- The agreed policy framework had now clarified that the University's policy was to support Green as the default option (OAPB-2 paragraph 6).

3. Project Report – Paper OAPB-3

3.1 Key points from the project report were reviewed briefly. The immediate priorities of the project team were to develop the options for handling the block grant, develop the communications plan and initiate user research in relation to facilitating open access choices.

3.2 The term 'academic representative' was agreed to be more appropriate than 'academic champion'. The role was to provide advice from an academic perspective and to help in developing communication channels and messages for Schools, Faculties and Departments.

3.3 In light of the policy framework, it was agreed that the majority of the money provisionally allocated in the transitional funding budget for payment of open access charges ahead of 1 April 2013 could be redirected to activities that supported Green open access.

4. AOB

4.1 It was agreed that a response should be made to the current House of Commons (BIS) Select Committee enquiry. It was expected that the Russell Group would be making a submission (as they had done to the House of Lords enquiry) and this would be reviewed before deciding whether a separate statement from the University was needed. **Action: Peta Stevens.**

4.2 University and Russell Group submissions to such enquiries could be posted on the open access website to demonstrate the University's active concern about these issues. Members of the project team were in close contact with colleagues at peer institutions.

4.2 Monographs were not covered by the RCUK policy but were the subject of exploratory initiatives such as OAPEN: <http://project.open.org/>.

4.3 The Project Board would meet again in about a month. In the meantime, any urgent matters would be decided by email circulation. **Action: Secretary.**